

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-42 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Support for these amendments is found throughout the disclosure of the present invention, *e.g.*, in the Specification, at page 10, lines 18-22; and in claims 11 and 18 as filed. Therefore, no new matter has been introduced. Applicant respectfully requests entry and favorable consideration of the present amendments, since they are believed to place the application in condition for allowance, or at a minimum to reduce the issues for appeal.

### *Brief Description of the Drawings*

The *Office Action* states that the instant specification lacks a brief description of the drawings. Applicant has herein amended the Specification to include a Brief Description of the Drawings (*i.e.*, Figures 1 through 5). Applicant has also amended the Specification to include the title of the section, "Detailed Description" after the Brief Description of the Drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that in light of these amendments, this objection has been overcome, and respectfully requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### *Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-42 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph*

Claims 1-10 and 12-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 has been rejected because, according to the *Office Action*, "[i]t is not clear what is intended in claim 1 by the phrase 'is such that' given that claim 1 does not disclose what feature 'is such that' refers to or what 'is' refers to." (*Office Action*, p. 2).

Applicant has clarified claim 1 to point out that the "is such that" language refers to the composition recited in claim 1. Support for this amendment can be found in,

e.g., claim 11 as filed, which was previously canceled in applicant's Amendment of March 10, 2003. As filed, claim 11 recited a process wherein the composition "is such that" in one of its cross sections,

20 to 60% of the total area occupied by the particles  
corresponds to particles having a diameter ranging from 0.1 to 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ,

5 to 20% of the total area occupied by the particles corresponds  
to particles having a diameter ranging from 1 to 1.6  $\mu\text{m}$ , and

20 to 75% of the total area occupied by the particles  
corresponds to particles having a diameter of greater than 1.6  $\mu\text{m}$ .

A review of the prosecution history of the present application shows that in the Amendment of March 10, 2003, applicant canceled claim 11 and incorporated the language of claim 11 into claim 1. Therefore, the present amendments to claim 1 have support throughout the disclosure of the present application.

The *Office Action* also states that claim 18 "makes no sense since it recites that 90% of the total area occupied by the particles correspond to capsules having a diameter." (*Office Action*, p. 2). Applicant has herein amended claim 18 to recite "capsules having a diameter ranging from 0.1 to 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ." This phrase can be found in claim 18 as filed, and it appears that the phrase was inadvertently omitted by applicant during prosecution. For example, in a *Preliminary Amendment* dated December 18, 2001, claim 18 recited a diameter "ranging from 0.1 to 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ." (See *Preliminary Amendment*, dated December 18, 2001, Appendix A, p. 22). However, in the next *Amendment* filed by applicant, dated March 10, 2003, it appears that the phrase was inadvertently eliminated from claim 18, even though the applicant did not indicate that that phrase of claim 18 was to be amended in the March 10, 2003 *Amendment*. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that this correction be accepted

into the record of the present application, and respectfully submits that as currently amended, claim 18 is not indefinite.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and request that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are patentable, and an earlier allowance is earnestly sought.

No fee is believed to be due for the submission of this After Final Amendment. However, should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Pennie & Edmonds Deposit Account No. 16-1150.

Respectfully submitted,

*Rachel J. Lin* Reg. No. 51,098  
*for Thomas G. Rowan* 34,419  
Thomas G. Rowan (Reg. No.)

Date: September 24, 2003

### **PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP**

1155 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2711  
(212) 790-9090

Attorneys for Applicant